

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
 Date: 3/31/2006 12:32:15 AM
 To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
 Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: March 31, 2006 00:10 AM
 NAME: patricia praschak
 ADDR1: 7534 independence street
 ADDR2:
 ADDR3:
 CITY: merrillville
 STATE: Indiana
 ZIP: 46410-4539
 PHONE:
 EMAIL: paullynn1007@aol.com
 msg:

RECEIVED
 MAY 15 2006
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
 U.S. House of Representatives
 2256 Rayburn House Office Building
 Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

patricia praschak
 7534 independence street
 merrillville, Indiana 46410
 cc:
 FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 012
 List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@hdoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/5/2006 3:01:23 AM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 5, 2006 02:32 AM
NAME: Bridget Stuckey
ADDR1: 6413 Jackson Ave.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Hammond
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46324-1201
PHONE:
EMAIL: bstuckey@ccc.edu
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Bridget Stuckey
6413 Jackson Ave.
Hammond, Indiana 46324
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 092
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerrep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/5/2006 11:02:34 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 5, 2006 10:40 PM
NAME: Marcia Mathew
ADDR1: 137 W Harris Pl
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Rensselaer
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47978-2011
PHONE:
EMAIL: mmathew@rensselaertv.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Marcia Mathew
137 W Harris Pl
Rensselaer, Indiana 47978
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 082
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/29/2006 12:01:58 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 29, 2006 11:42 AM
NAME: Jeff Drinski
ADDR1: 15025 S. 376 W.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Kentland
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47951-1370
PHONE:
EMAIL: j_drinski@hotmail.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 1 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeff Drinski
15025 S. 376 W.
Kentland, Indiana 47951
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies 002
List ASOC

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/3/2006 1:32:15 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 3, 2006 1:13 PM
NAME: Irene Wagenblast
ADDR1: 3110 100th Place
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Highland
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46322-3315
PHONE:
EMAIL: riwagenblast@aol.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Irene Wagenblast
3110 100th Place
Highland, Indiana 46322-3215
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

082

CC DCT 96-45

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/2/2006 2:02:47 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DATE: May 2, 2006 1:51 PM
NAME: Linda Beauchaine
ADDR1: 1904 Creekside Ct.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Valparaiso
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46383-0965
PHONE:
EMAIL: lmrba@aol.com
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda Beauchaine
1904 Creekside Ct.
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 012
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/1/2006 9:32:49 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 1, 2006 9:12 PM
NAME: Alfreda Kurz
ADDR1: 2640 Turin Dr.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Schererville
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46375-2355
PHONE:
EMAIL: alfreku@sbcglobal.net
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Alfreda Kurz
2640 Turin Dr.
Schererville, Indiana 46375-2355
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 012
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/1/2006 11:32:28 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DATE: May 1, 2006 11:10 PM
NAME: Janet Parman
ADDR1: 617 S Sparling Ave
ADDR2: Apt 112
ADDR3:
CITY: Rensselaer
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47978-9104
PHONE:
EMAIL: flyneagle2003@aol.com
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Janet Parman
617 S Sparling Ave
Apt 112
Rensselaer, Indiana 47978
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0+2
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@hseoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/2/2006 12:02:10 AM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 1, 2006 11:41 PM
NAME: Linda Tanner
ADDR1: 335 Maple Street
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Crown Point
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46307-2614
PHONE:
EMAIL: gilandlinda@peoplepc.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda Tanner
335 Maple Street
Crown Point, Indiana 46307
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0+2

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/2/2006 7:01:22 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 2, 2006 06:40 AM
NAME: Timothy Wolfe
ADDR1: 7911 West 245th Ave
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Lowell
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46356-9216
PHONE:
EMAIL: wolfer@core.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Timothy Wolfe
7911 West 245th Ave
Lowell, Indiana 46356
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 2
List ABOVE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/1/2006 7:33:26 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 1, 2006 7:32 PM
NAME: Kent Armstrong
ADDR1: 3902 Hemlock Drive
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Valparaiso
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46383-1814
PHONE:
EMAIL: kaygeea2001@yahoo.com
nsg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Kent Armstrong
3902 Hemlock Drive
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 092
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/30/2006 9:31:32 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 30, 2006 09:11 AM
NAME: Pamela Kult
ADDR1: 710 E. 3rd Street
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Fowler
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47944-1342
PHONE:
EMAIL: pkultblue@yahoo.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Pamela Kult
710 E. 3rd Street
Fowler, Indiana 47944
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/30/2006 3:31:45 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 30, 2006 3:13 PM
NAME: Aggie DeBruicker
ADDR1: 300 N. Washington
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Fowler
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47944-1169
PHONE:
EMAIL: Sixthtoy@msn.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C.

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Aggie DeBruicker
300 N. Washington
Fowler, Indiana 47944
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@hseoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/30/2006 7:31:54 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 30, 2006 7:10 PM
NAME: cary heuer
ADDR1: 5351 n. vasa terrace
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: lowell
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46356-1172
PHONE:
EMAIL: strikecut9999@yahoo.com
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

cary heuer
5351 n. vasa terrace
lowell, Indiana 46356
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerrep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/27/2006 1:32:57 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 27, 2006 1:17 PM
NAME: T Donald
ADDR1: 2323 West 11th Avenue
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Gary
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46404-2208
PHONE:
EMAIL: devethure@aol.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

T Donald
2323 West 11th Avenue
Gary, Indiana 46404
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/23/2006 1:31:32 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 23, 2006 01:10 AM
NAME: Deborah Tyre
ADDR1: 461 E 700 N
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Wheatfield
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46392-8351
PHONE:
EMAIL: tucker@netnitco.net
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Deborah Tyre
461 E 700 N
Wheatfield, Indiana 46392
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 2
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/23/2006 12:31:24 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DATE: April 23, 2006 00:10 AM
NAME: Luke Petropoulos
ADDR1: 12301 W. 157th Ave.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Lowell
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46356-9635
PHONE:
EMAIL: jpslpjl@yahoo.com
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Luke Petropoulos
12301 W. 157th Ave.
Lowell, Indiana 46356
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 092
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/22/2006 9:32:10 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 22, 2006 9:10 PM
NAME: Jay Scott
ADDR1: 7332 VanBuren Avenue
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Hammond
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46324-2548
PHONE:
EMAIL: jscamino@aol.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 1 6 2006
Federal Communications Commission

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Jay Scott
7332 VanBuren Avenue
Hammond, Indiana 46324-2548
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/21/2006 6:05:16 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 21, 2006 5:41 PM
NAME: Gerri McCarthy
ADDR1: 736 N. Arbogast
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Griffith
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46319-2408
PHONE:
EMAIL: gmc736@sbcglobal.net
msg:

RECEIVED
APR 15 2006
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Gerri McCarthy
736 N. Arbogast
Griffith, Indiana 46319
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 2
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20541

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/26/2006 10:33:00 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 26, 2006 10:11 PM
NAME: Sonja Cain
ADDR1: 601 S Park Ave
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Fowler
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47944-1722
PHONE:
EMAIL: shayden19@yahoo.com
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Sonja Cain
601 S Park Ave
Fowler, Indiana 47944
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 2
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/18/2006 3:32:00 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 18, 2006 3:12 PM
NAME: Adeline Jolink
ADDR1: 425 11th Circle S E
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: DeMotte
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46310-8480
PHONE:
EMAIL: ajolink@nitco.net
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Adeline Jolink
425 11th Circle S E
DeMotte, Indiana 46310
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/13/2006 7:01:54 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 13, 2006 6:40 PM
NAME: donna malone
ADDR1: 815 n oakwood
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: griffith
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46319-2429
PHONE:
EMAIL: malonel983@sbcglobal.net
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

donna malone
815 n oakwood
griffith, Indiana 46319
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/13/2006 9:31:49 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DATE: April 13, 2006 9:15 PM
NAME: aubrey steinkamp
ADDR1: 828 n Melville
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Rensselaer
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 47978-2118
PHONE:
EMAIL: ajsteinkamp@nwiis.com
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

aubrey steinkamp
828 n Melville
Rensselaer, Indiana 47978-2118
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/17/2006 1:01:26 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 17, 2006 00:41 AM
NAME: Thomas Bednarz
ADDR1: 808 Dogwood ST. NW.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Demotte
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46310-9549
PHONE:
EMAIL: uncltommy59@comcast.net
msg:

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Thomas Bednarz
808 Dogwood ST. NW.
Demotte, Indiana 46310
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0+2
List ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 4/17/2006 12:31:21 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: April 17, 2006 00:11 AM
NAME: Marie Hayward
ADDR1: 543 Raven Rd.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Valparaiso
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46385-8133
PHONE:
EMAIL: maliboot4@hotmail.com
msg:

RECEIVED
MAY 15 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20541

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Marie Hayward
543 Raven Rd.
Valparaiso, Indiana 46385
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 042
List ABCDE